



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/704,558	11/03/2000	Yasuhito Taira	001475	4557

38834 7590 08/03/2005

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP
1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, NW
SUITE 700
WASHINGTON, DC 20036

EXAMINER

BLACKWELL, JAMES H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/704,558

Applicant(s)

TAIRA, YASUHIITO

Examiner

James H. Blackwell

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 April 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 5-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 April 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action is in response to Amendment submitted 04/12/2005 originating from an original application with foreign priority date **02/29/2000**.
2. Claims 1-4 have been canceled. Claims 5-8, which are newly added, remain pending.
3. The objection to the title of the specification has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.
4. The objection to the drawings has been withdrawn as necessitated by amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claim ⁵⁻⁸~~5~~ is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over DuFresne (U.S. Patent No. 5,835,712 filed 05/03/1996) in view of Spence et al. (hereinafter Spence, U.S. Patent No., 6,185,600 filed 12/08/1997)

In regard to independent Claim 5, DuFresne teaches *A processor connected via a network system to an operation terminal in which inputs are made through a Web browser* in that Fig. 6 shows an HTTP server (63) (*a processor*) connected via a network to a web client (*executing on an operation terminal unit containing a web*

browser). The web client receives HTML pages from the server, the page, containing a web form (62), gets displayed on the web client (61), which allows for inputs. When inputs are collected on a web form page, the browser forwards the input values to a web server specified by the web form. Upon receiving the form, the server (*processor*), executing web server software (*interpreter*), starts a program to process the information transmitted from the web client HTML form. Such programs are known as the "common gateway interface" programs, or the "CGI scripts" (*an interpreter that (1) interprets CGI scripts*) (Col. 7, lines 59-62).

DuFresne fails to explicitly teach that the web server software (*interpreter*) (2) *analyzes a description of a display control file, which is designated by the web browser, describing therein display control information for a web page that is displayed on the operation terminal*. However, Spence teaches a universal event browser (*a web client*) operable for viewing and browsing network and system events for a number of different product specific applications (see Abstract). In this invention, each product specific application is associated with a product specification file which contains window display configuration parameters, preferably written in a generic specification language (*separate display control file for each application*) (see Abstract).

Spence also teaches that the universal event browser provides a universal user interface generator operable to communicate with the appropriate product specific interface to retrieve event data from the appropriate product specific event repository, and to utilize the window display parameters from the appropriate product specification file to generate a universal interface data for use by a standard internet browser in

displaying the even data (*describing therein display control information for a web page that is displayed on the operation terminal*) (see Abstract).

Spence also teaches that the interpreter (3) *processes a processing program based on the description of the display control file* (see above discussion with respect to limitation (2)).

Spence also teaches that the interpreter (4) outputs the display control information described in the display control file to the web browser based on the result of the processing (see above discussion with respect to limitation (2)).

Finally, Spence also teaches that *the display control file, the CGI scripts, and the processing program are configured separately* (see Fig. 1). It is clear from Fig. 1 that each of these components is separate from the others. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to be able to edit/configure each of these components separately because the invention is designed to be universal, allowing for at least the ability to add or subtract new components, each representing a different program application to be viewed by a user on a web browser.

Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to combine the teachings of DuFresne and Spence as both inventions relate to client/server systems processing inputs from clients, and returning results. One benefit of adding the teaching of Spence is to allow for the addition and/or removal of software applications to monitor without having to rewrite, test, and compile a new set of applications each time.

In regard to dependent Claim 6, DuFresne teaches that *in the display control file, the display control information is described separately in a file control division and an HTML division* in that a template is a hypertext form, which includes a text area for entering source text such that the source can be edited and updated by accessing the template through any browser. Alternatively, the source can be inserted into a template through an electronic mail transfer. Each template further includes input fields for entering access control lists for specifying authorized users to read, write or execute the source in the template. Each template also includes an identification field for entering the template name (*file control division*). In a preferred embodiment, the templates are stored in a template database. The field names and corresponding contents of a template are stored in a content database. The server of the present invention controls both the template and content databases. Preferably, sources to all Web pages controlled by the processor of the present invention are constructed using templates. As previously mentioned, a source contains HTML tags and tag extensions of the present invention (*HTML division*). The extensions are directed to field names and corresponding field values. These values can be static but more often, they are variables, such as instructions, other tag extensions, URL's, or scripts. The values further can point to other templates (Col. 3, lines 60-67; Col. 4, lines 1-16)

In regard to dependent Claim 7, DuFresne teaches that *the interpreter reads the display control information for each line and executes an analyzing process* in that each service request by the client (61) invokes a template (62) containing both static HTML and executable codes in an input field (Col. 9, lines 26-28). Additionally, each template

in a preferred form provides identification and access control fields to identify and secure itself. The template (62) also includes "scripts" to perform various functions. The template is processed by the processor (63a) and each code is replaced by a stored data value or executed to perform certain task (Col. 9, lines 31- 33).

In regard to dependent Claim 8, DuFrense teaches that *the interpreter embeds, based on the description of the HTML division, dynamic information related to the display of the Web page in HTML output and outputs the HTML output* in that each service request by the client (61) invokes a template (62) containing both static HTML and executable codes in an input field (Col. 9, lines 26-28). Additionally, each template in a preferred form provides identification and access control fields to identify and secure itself. The template (62) also includes "scripts" to perform various functions. The template is then processed by the processor (63a) and each code is replaced by a stored data value or executed to perform certain task (Col. 9, lines 31- 33).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments with respect to Claims 1-4 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Specifically, Applicant argues that the prior art of DuFresne, the display control file, the CGI, script and the processing program are not configured separately, but, in contrast, applicant configures those elements separately in the present invention. Thus, DuFresne does not teach the subject matter explicitly. The Examiner agrees and withdraws the rejection. However, the Examiner now introduces the prior art of Spence et al., which depicts the claimed components as separate. If they are separate, they would have been able to be configured/edited separately.

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James H. Blackwell whose telephone number is 571-272-4089. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

James H. Blackwell
07/28/05

William S. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
7/28/2005